

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – OAKLAND DIVISION

JOSE GUARDADO, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 4:22-cv-04319-JSW
Case No. 4:22-cv-06013-JSW

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO
CONSOLIDATE CASE NUMBERS:**

**4:22-cv-03975-JSW
4:22-cv-01587-JSW
4:22-cv-07455-JSW
3:22-cv-04633-JD
4:22-cv-07645-JSW
4:23-cv-00211-JSW**

Date Action Filed: July 26, 2022
Trial Date: Not Set

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 On June 23, 2023, the Parties appeared before this Court to argue the City and County of San
 2 Francisco's, the City and County of San Francisco Human Services Agency's, the City and County of San
 3 Francisco Department of Public Health's, and the San Francisco Public Library's (collectively,
 4 "Defendant") Motion to Consolidate this case, (1) *Guardado, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco*,
 5 Case No. 4:22-cv-04319-JSW and (2) *Shaheed, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco*, Case No. 4:22-
 6 cv-06013-JSW, with (3) *Gozum v. City and County of San Francisco Human Services Agency*, Case No.
 7 4:22-cv-03975-JSW; (4) *Debrunner, et al. v. The City and County of San Francisco, et al.*, Case No. 4:22-
 8 cv-07455-JSW; (5) *Cook v. City and County of San Francisco*, Case No. 4:22-cv-07645-JSW; (6) *Sanders*
 9 *v. San Francisco Public Library, et al.*, Case No. 4:23-cv-00211-JSW; (7) *Keene, et al. v. City and County*
 10 *of San Francisco, et al.*, Case No. 4:22-cv-01587-JSW; and (8) *Monegas v. City and County of San*
 11 *Francisco Department of Public Health*, Case No. 3:22-cv-04633-JD (collectively, the "Related Vaccine
 12 Actions"). Defendant requests that the Related Vaccine Actions should be consolidated at least through
 13 summary judgment and permit the Parties to revisit consolidation for trial purposes, if necessary.

14 Having heard oral argument on this matter and having reviewed the Parties' papers:

15 **THE COURT HEREBY ORDERS:**

16 Defendant's Motion is **GRANTED**. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a) authorizes the court to
 17 consolidate cases that involve common allegations of law or fact pending in the same district, even if
 18 currently pending before different judges. *See Investors Research Co. v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for Cent. Dist. of*
 19 *Cal.*, 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir. 1989). "The purpose of consolidation is to enhance court efficiency and
 20 to avoid substantial danger of inconsistent adjudications." *Tehrani v. Int'l Cycle Works, Inc.*, No. SA CV
 21 06-20 DOC RNBX, 2007 WL 6548862, at *1 (C.D. Cal. June 19, 2007). "While a district court does have
 22 broad discretion in determining whether consolidation is appropriate, typically, consolidation is favored."
 23 *Tse v. Apple, Inc.*, No. C 12-02653 SBA, 2013 WL 451639, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 5, 2013); *In re Oreck*
 24 *Corp. Halo Vacuum & Air Purifiers Mktg. & Sales*, 282 F.R.D. 486, 490 (C.D. Cal. 2012).

25 The Court finds that Defendant has established that consolidation is proper under Rule 42.
 26 Specifically, the Court finds that the Related Vaccine Actions all involve nearly identical legal theories,
 27 nearly identical claims under California and federal law and/or the state and federal constitutions, have
 28

1 certain overlapping facts, and all name the City as a defendant. *See, e.g., Ho Keung Tse v. Apple, Inc.*,
 2 No. C 12-02653 SBA, 2013 WL 451639, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 5, 2013) (consolidating patent infringement
 3 cases even though the plaintiff alleged that different products violated the patent in question); *Paxonet*
 4 *Comm’ns, Inc. v. TranSwitch Corp.*, 303 F. Supp. 2d 1027, 1028-29 (N.D. Cal. 2003) (consolidating two
 5 cases involving three of the same patents and “the same underlying technology,” even though one case
 6 included allegations related to a fourth patent). For example, each of the Related Vaccine Actions, with
 7 the exception of the *Monegas* Action, involves claims under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act against
 8 Defendant for allegedly failing to accommodate Plaintiffs’ religious beliefs and/or for discriminating
 9 against Plaintiffs for their held religious beliefs. Further, six of these Actions involve claims arising under
 10 California Fair Employment and Housing Act (Cal. Govt. Code § 12900, et seq.) (“FEHA”), for allegedly
 11 failing to accommodate Plaintiffs’ religious beliefs. (*See, e.g.*, the *Guardado* Action, the *Gozum* Action,
 12 the *Keene* Action, the *Debrunner* Action, the *Cook* Action, and the *Shaheed* Action.)

13 Consolidation is also appropriate here because the City and County of San Francisco is the chief,
 14 actual, or sole defendant in each of these actions. Further, given the broad class definition in the *Guardado*
 15 Action, the Court finds that virtually all of the Plaintiffs in each of the Related Vaccine Actions are likely
 16 part of the putative class in that matter.

17 Finally, the Court finds that consolidation is proper because consolidation will also promote
 18 efficiency, preserve judicial resources, and will not prejudice any party of these proceedings.

19 Accordingly, the Court hereby consolidates the Related Vaccine Actions through summary
 20 judgment and permits the Parties to revisit consolidation for trial purposes at that time.

21

22 **IT IS SO ORDERED**

23

24

25 Hon. Jeffrey S. White

26

27

28